App. F IX-4

192

File No.

Serial Nos.

Previous References

Later References

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos.

Part B for

SUBJECT

Removal of the present Parpathegar of the Sri Siddalingeswara Swamy temple at Yediyur Kunigal Taluq.

G.O. dd 7 13 clauses

27.1.26

To the Surv.-Comr.

Records the communication of the Surv.-Comr stating that there are no valid reasons for changing the Brahmin Parpathe

1039

REPLY

(To be written on this margin.)

M 40

OFFICE OF THE D 1551

SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL

Muz 27-26-1

NOTE

Dated.... Mysore....21st June ....1926.

Sri Vaishnava parupathegar of the temple at Yediyur.-

We may consider again the question whether it is desirable to replace the Sri Vaishnava parupathegar by a Lingayat parupathegar. A note on this point may be put up in the light of the reports so far received. If necessary, we may consult the Muzrai Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner before finally settling this matter.

Revenue Secretary
with
compliments.

Muz 21 6-26

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25

Serial No.

All the connected files since heard out, are submitted for perusal.

2. The temple of Sri Siddalingeswara Swamy at Yediyur in the Kunigal Taluk is a mezrai institution endowed with inam lands, measuring 146 acres and assessed at Rs 108-4-0 with a jodi of Rs 30-1-0. A sum of Rs 5-13-2 is deducted from the quit-rent payable on a portion of the inam lands, on account of money allowance.

There are 12 Archaks of Veerasaiva community who are reported to be conducting worship.

The Inamdar Dy. Com'r's. letter Dy 2-5-1904 shows how these Archaks were then mismanaging the temple affairs. The temple income about 500 to 600 Rs during the car festival was being appropriated by the Archaks for their own use, the temple ornaments etc. were not satisfactorily accounted for the sums for which perpetual deposits had been made by the late Palavai Venjaroje urs, were not being performed the inam lands had been alienated and no accounts were maintained. In G O no 3848-56 Dy 10-6-1904, the management the temple was assumed by the Mez. Deptt, and placed under the Amildar of the Kunigal Taluk.

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25

eral and Revenue Secretariat | File No. | of 192 .

Serial No.

By the Veerasaiva conference held at Kurugod on the 16th August 1925 through its President Mr. J. Rudrappa, and in Interpellations nos. 19 and 35 brought up by the same gentleman, during the Legislative Council held on 23rd July 1926, and also during the recent Budget Session of the Representative Assembly in June 1926, complaints against the present Parpatteyar - a Srivaishnava Brahman - are brought up and the appointment of a Veera Saiva Parapatteyar is opposed. The complaints against the Brahman Parpatteyar are that he is a man of a different Community, not having no access to the inside of the temple, cannot make out whether religious rites were properly conducted, and his unnecessary and frequent interference have caused annoyance to the devotees.

The Parpatteyar's father - Ranga Iyengar - was doing the Sambogi work of the temple viz keeping of accounts i.e. cash register etc. since 1886, and after assumption in 1904 he continued as Sanbog till 1915, when owing to old age his son (the present Parpatteyar) was appointed. The present Parpatteyar succeeded his father as the Sanbog of the temple and later when the Sambogi appointed

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25

Serial No.

was merged in that of Parpatteegar he became the Parpatteegan himself (Vide G.O. No. 960-62 Mmz. 9C-9-25 12-9-1919).

The Amildar's Report Dy 25.5.26 explains the several complaints against the Parpatteegar.

Re the removal of the present Parpatteegar who is a Sri Vaishnava Brahman on the score of his being a man of different community etc, it is reported that including 12 Archakas' houses, there are only 17 families belonging to Veera-Saiva Community in the village, and that the neighbouring villages contain a small population of this community. It is reported that out of the total number of devotees, only 25% are Lingayats, the remaining 75% belonging to different Communities - Vakkaligars, Brahmans etc. (The latter do not come in the temple) that there has been no complaint or objection brought against the present Parpatteegar, and that, if a Lingayat Parpatteegan is entertained, all the work during the car festival will suffer. It is further reported that the present Parpatteegar and his fathers before him have held this post for a long time during which they have managed the temple affairs so satisfactorily

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25

General and Revenue Secretariat

Mys File No. 27 of 1926.

Serial No.

That there has been an accumulation of funds to the extent of Rs 8235/- at the credit of the temple. Both the Amildar and the Dy. Comr are of opinion that there are not sufficient reasons for the removal of the Brahman Parpathegar. Attention is respectfully invited to the Junior Dy. Comr's. letter Dy 28-5-1926 to the Mys. Comr containing the observation that the whole agitation is an attempt on the part of the Pujaris to get hold of the management, so that they may manage or to be more correct, mismanage the temple as they used to do before the S.O. of 1904, and that the practice of not entirely entrusting the election of Dharmadarsis to the particular community to which the mutt belongs is a healthy arrangement, and is in force in the case of the big Sri Vaishna mutts in the Mysore dist (Melkote, Seringapatam etc.).

Submitted for orders as to whether the M.C's opinion may be called for on Mr Ruddappa's Interpellation urging the necessity for the removal of the Parpathegar.

AM 16.7.26.

Refce:- Members minute on page

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

the Mys. Comr's

Serial No.

Views in the matter may also be called for.

Rev. Secy/ 20/7

Yes

Kindly put up a draft letter to me

CRs 24-7-26

26/

1 Draft submitted for approval.

27.7.26 27-7-26 Rev. Secy/ 27/7

Issue CRs 28-7-26

2. To, Mrs Cowan

No 181 dt 30-7-26.

Requesting him to submit a report on the desirability of replacing the Sri Vaishnava Pancharatra Agama Pathasala by a Sanskrit [illegible]

31/5/28

G.R.S III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Mysore.

Mr. D.S. Mallappa:
(15) Appointment of a Lingayet Parpathegar to the Yedeyur temple in Kunigal taluk.

D 195

Rajakaryaprasakta Diwan Bahadur Mr. M.N. Krishna Rao:—The case which Mr. Mallappa refers to is under consideration and orders will be passed soon.

D 195
Mus 27-26.

Mus 7 no 27-26 on the subject is submitted.

In this office Cou 21 no 181 dy 30-7-1926, the M.C's opinion has been called for on the above subject.

That office's report may be awaited.

Secretary 10/8/26 Rev. Secy 11/8 12/8/26

Finally send a reminder every fortnight in this case so that the subject maybe disposed of before Dasara

Revs
13 8 26

Please
Remember
15.8.26

N B —Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

REPLY

(To be written on this margin.)

6 ARIA OFFICE OF THE SECO
MEMBER OF COUNCIL.

321 NOTE May 27-26

Dated.....192

1) A case relating to the Medigam Temple in the Kunigal Taluk was discussed at the last Session of the L.C. His final decision may be expected soon

6/9/26

The Rev Secy with compts

---

16 Put up a DO reminder 16 days & send a reminder once a week.

ERO
1.9.26

1) draft today & please for reminder

1/9

av 29

Dft. submitted by Diwan-1 29/8/26 28/8/26

No. 1480 & 2-9-26.

to Mess Comm---

WD 11264—GPB—40,000—17-12-26

General and Revenue Secretariat

Mug File No. 27 of 1926.

Serial No. 3

From the Mug. Comr., letter no. C 470 of 26-27 of 11.10.26

Forwards copy of Tumkur Dy. Comr's letter no. M 305 of 29.9.26 reporting in the matter and states that he agrees with the D.C. in his views that the question of appointing a Lingayet Parupattegar may be considered when there is a vacancy.

The D.C. states that there is no local feeling against the present Sri Vaishnava Parupattegar, that 5 Lingayet Dharmadarsis out of 9, have raised no objection against the present man; that the Amildar is of opinion that a person having considerable local influence has to be the Parupattegar of the institution and that there is no bitch of any kind in the management of the institution for so many (40) years past and that to remove him now without any valid reasons would be a hardship to him.

The M.C. in agreeing with the D.C. adds that the question of appointing a Lingayet Parupattegar may be considered when there is a vacancy.

Refer para 15 preceding page.

SD 14/10/26

14/10

NOTE—Contn Sheet

497

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. Army File No. 27 of 1926

Serial No.

23. Submitted with reference to paras (1) and (15) above.

Attention is invited to paras 2 to 9 giving the facts of the case. The D.C. in his letter of 24/5/26 states that this was an attempt on the part of the Authorities to get rid of supervision. (Vide also D.C's letter of 29/9/26 as forwarded with Finance letter) The Finance Commissioner does not think ... and agrees with the D.C. in ... the recommendation that the question of having a Lingayet parganathum may be considered at the time of next changing the Panel it may be approved

MW
19/10

25

Secretary

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA IN COUNCIL
20 OCT. 1926
No. 2838

26 Secretary of State ... note of ... Government ... take any particular action in regard to this matter

MW
26.10.26

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 27 of 1926

Serial No.

1 L. C. Bro. of June 1926 were looked into, and this subject did not then come up.

2 During the R. A. meeting of the Budget Session held in June 1926, this subject had been brought up by Mr. J. Rudrappa, R. A. member of the Tumkur Taluk, and was discussed at length (vide pages 74 - 77). No particular action was promised.

3 Submtd. with ref. to the members minutes ie para 26 of the Hon. Secs submtd.

7.11.26. 7.11.26

Second Member).

Reading correspondence

30 The ~~first~~ may be read & recorded. No action is now necessary and no view of Govt need therefore be now expressed

9.11.26

31 D/S. G.O. recording submtd

12.11.26.

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
8 NOV. 1926
No. 3148.

893

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

491

WD 01226—GPB—37,500—1-9-26

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 27 | of 192

Serial No.	
3	Slip recording the correspondence & putting for appl. Sd 12-11-26 324 / Issue MV 20/11
4	To the Mun. Comr, G.O No. 9738 27-11-26. Records the correspondence ending with M C's letter no. 4709 K-10-26 stating that there are no valid reasons for changing the Brahmin Parupatyam.

NOTE Contn Sheet

APP. F. VI. cl.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section mus

File No. 27-26

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. 181

Revenue file

To

The Inves. Comr.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Sir,

Date of issue 30/7/26

Signed by mv.

Adverting to your letter No. C. 1317 dt 1st June 1926 reporting on interpellation no. 35 by Mr J. Rudrappa, R.A. member, Tumkur in the matter removal of the present Parpathegar of the ~~Management~~ of Sri Siddalingeswara Swamy temple at Gedigur in the Kunigal Taluk, etc. I am directed to request that you will be pleased to go into the matter and furnish your views as to whether it is desirable

over

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

to replace the present
Srivaishnava Parpathegar
of the said temple by a
Lingayat Parpathegar
(2) In favour of a very
early reply is requested.
(3) The enclosures are herewith
returned for ref. & necessary

I have the
honour to
be
Sir
Your most obedient
servant
Sd/-
Asst Secretary
27.7.26

Dy No 28726

GMGR

No. C 470 / 26/27 Cur file

#4497
Mur 27-26-3 14

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner In Mysore,

Dated Bangalore the 9th October 1926.

From

G. S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner In Mysore, B A N G A L O R E.

To

B. Sreenivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness

The Maharaja of Mysore, Financial Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 181/M.F. 27-26-2 dated 30th July 1 regarding the removal of the present Parpathegar of the Yediyur Temples, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of letter No. M.305/26-27 dated 29-9-1926 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District submitting a repor in the matter.

2. I agree with the views expressed by the Deputy Commissioner. The question of appointing a Lingayet as Parepathegar may be considered when there is a vacancy in the office in the usual course of things.

3. The enclosures are returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant,

for Muzrai Commissioner.
(absent from station)

RM

Letter No.305/26-27 dated 29th September 1926 from the Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

"With reference to your Memo No.C.1317/25-26 dated 17th August 1926, requesting to furnish my views in the matter of the replacement of the present Sri Vaishnava Brahmin Parapathegar of the Sri Shadalingeswaraswami temple at Nediyur in the Kunigal Taluk, by a Lingayet ---- Parapathegar, I have the honor to state that the Amildar, who was --- consulted again in the matter reports that the present individual may be continued as the Parapathegar of the temple in view of the facts that there has been no ~~ever~~ feeling locally against the man and that the affairs of the temple have thrived well since the time of his father as already reported by him. He, further, states that a person, who is a native of Nediyur and is working elsewhere for his livelihood, is desirous of settling himself at the place and with this end in view has been doing his best to gain his object on the plea that the institution requires a Lingayet Parapathegar. The Amildar is of opinion that a person having considerable local influence has to be the Parapathegar of the institution as otherwise the mustering of the people at the time of the Jatra and other occasions for getting through certain functions will not be possible, and adds that there has been no hitch of any kind in the management for so many years past.

2. I have already expressed my opinion in the matter (vide para 3 of my letter No.H.C.192/25-26 dated 21st February 1926 and the subsequent communication No.D_2 Dis.1918/25-26 dated 28th May 1926 addressed to you on the subject.) In this connection I wish to add that there are ---- 9 Dharmadarsis to this institution and 5 of them are Lingayets and none of them has raised any objection against the present Brahmin Parapathegar. The present Parapathegar's father held this post for a period of 30 years since the year 1865 as "Temple Shanbhogue" and after him, his son the present man has succeeded to the post, which was subsequently styled as Parapathegar's post and the appointment has thus become more or less -- hereditory one. As such, to remove him at this length of time without any valid reasons would be a hardship to him.

3. The connected records ending with the Kunigal Taluk Amildar's No.C.C.71/26-27 dated 8th September 1926 are enclosed."

"C o p y"

for Muzrai Commissioner

Mur. 7]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

SECTION Mur

FILE No. 27-26

SERIAL No. 4

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

the 192 .

Proceedings of the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Date of issue 27-11-26

Signed by. Mr. Venkata [illegible]

Read—

Interpellation no 35 brought up during the Budget Session in June 1924 by Mr J. Rudrappa, R. A. Member, Tumkur, in the matter of the Removal of the present Parpathegar of Sri Siddalingeswara Swamy temple at Yediyur in the Kunigal Taluk.

Order Thereon No.

Correspondence ending with letter noted 5.11.26

May this be

i Printed?

ii treated as a standing order?

iii published in the Gazette. English Part?

iv translated?

v placed at the disposal of the press?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part?

RD
25/11

from The Huzzai Comr.
forwarding copy of letter
No. H. 305/26-27 dy 29-9-1926
from The Dy. Comr.,
Tumkur Dist., reporting
that the present Parpathegar's
father held the said post
for a period of 30 years
since the years 1885 as
"Temple Sandag" and after
him, his son the present
man has succeeded to the
post, which was subsequently
styled the Parpathegar's
post, that there are 4
Dharmadarshi to this temple
of them 3 are Lingayats,
and none of them has
raised any objection against
the Brahman Parpathegar,
and to remove the present
Parpathegar at this
early of time without any
valid reasons would be a
hardship to him

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

VD 0566—2000—GPB—29-7-22

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft to*) m.)

that he agrees with the views expressed by the Dy. Comm ~~and that the question of appointment of another~~

order N973

Recorded.

Preparations may be considered when a letter of vacancy occurs in the post in the Naval Service

Dy. Secretary. 12/11/26

Mr. Haig — Comm a Reg. and S.

MGCPB—30,000—5-1-0